



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,022	02/17/2004	Mukul Chawla	CIS0205US	9596
33031 7590 01/04/2010 CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP 11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE BLDG. H, SUITE 250 AUSTIN, TX 78758				
EXAMINER SMARTH, GERALD A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2446				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/04/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,022

Applicant(s)

CHAWLA ET AL.

Examiner

GERALD SMARTH

Art Unit

2446

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02/14/2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/10/04
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The instant application having Application No. 10/780022 has a total of 55 claims pending in the application; there are 4 independent claims and 51 dependent claims, all of which are ready for examination by the examiner.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. As required by **M.P.E.P. 609(C)**, the applicant's submissions of the Information Disclosure Statements dated 05/10/04 are acknowledged by the examiner and the cited references have been considered in the examination of the claims now pending. As required by **M.P.E.P 609 C(2)**, a copy of the PTOL-1449 initiated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1, 12, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 uses the phrase "A method comprising: accessing a first lookup table...."

This claim is considered to be directed to software since it lacks the hardware or components to be considered a machine.

Claim 19 uses the phrase "A system comprising: a first lookup table...", This claim is considered to be directed to software since it lacks the hardware or components to be considered a machine.

Claim 34 uses the phrase "A computer readable medium, comprising program instructions..."

Referring to the applicants specification, it reads "in some embodiments, a computer readable medium is a carrier medium such as a network and/or a wireless link upon which signals such as electrical, electromagnetic, or digital signals, on which the data and instructions implementing....."; Paragraph 105.

This is directed to intangible medium. Signals, Carrier waves, etc. are not considered to be statutory.

Claim 41 uses the phrase "A system comprising: means for accessing a first lookup table..."

This claim is considered to be directed to software since it lacks the hardware or components to be considered a machine.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 16, 19, 20, 24, 25, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41 42, 46, 47, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Sanchez (2003/0223402)

Regarding claim 1, Sanchez teaches a method, comprising:

accessing a first lookup table based on a first portion of a packet header, wherein the first portion of the packet header comprises at least part of a multicast destination address, **(Sanchez fig. 2) (Sanchez discloses in operation, after receiving a multicast packet, Interface Identifier Retrieval Logic 31 examines the packet's header and retrieves two expected incoming interface identifiers--a source-specific one from the Unicast Routing Table 10 and a flow-specific one from the Multicast FIT 20 according to the header information. Paragraph [32])** and the first lookup table identifies a portion of a second lookup table, the portion of the second lookup table comprising at least one entry; **(Sanchez discloses the network node may also perform a lookup on a second table (e.g., a Unicast Routing Table) to retrieve another incoming interface identifier; Paragraph [8])** and accessing the portion of the second lookup table based on a second portion of the packet header. **(Sanchez discloses however, if the RPF Flag is not set, at step 48, the RPF engine 50 retrieves a unicast outgoing interface identifier corresponding to the packet's header information from the Unicast Routing Table; Paragraph [39])**

Regarding claims 2, 20 & 42, Sanchez taught the method and system of claims 1, 19 & 41, as described above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the second lookup table identifies at least one output interface via which a packet comprising the packet header should be output. ***(Sanchez discloses and then retrieves an interface identifier from either the Unicast Routing Table 10 or the Multicast FIT 20 according to the value of the RPF Flag. paragraph [35])***

Regarding claims 6, 24 & 46, Sanchez taught the method and system of claims 2, 21, & 42, as describe above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the packet header comprises a source address, the portion of the second lookup table corresponds to a shortest-path multicast tree if a match for the source address is found in the first lookup table, ***(Sanchez discloses whether the router has already joined the Shortest Path Tree (SPT) for the (S,G) flow; Paragraph [20])*** and the portion of the second lookup table corresponds to a shared multicast tree if no match for the source address is found in the first lookup table. ***(Sanchez discloses if there is a match, the multicast packet is received on a correct incoming interface, and the network node will forward the multicast packet. However, if the identifiers do not match, the network node will discard the multicast packet; Paragraph [26])***

Regarding claim 7, 25 & 47 Sanchez taught the method and system of claims 2, 20 & 42, as described above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the accessing the portion of

the second lookup table comprises providing a key to the second lookup table, wherein the key comprises an ID of a RPF (Reverse Path Forwarding) interface, and the RPF interface received a packet in which the packet header was comprised. **(Sanchez discloses a RPF Flag stored in association with multicast flow information determines from which table the interface identifier is obtained; Abstract)**

Regarding claim 16, Sanchez taught the method of claim 2, as described above further comprising:

allocating a single entry in the first lookup table for each shortest-path multicast tree. **(Sanchez discloses whether the router has already joined the Shortest Path Tree (SPT) for the (S,G) flow; Paragraph [20])**

Regarding claim 19, Sanchez teaches a system comprising: a first lookup table comprising a plurality of first lookup table entries; a second lookup table comprising a plurality of second lookup table entries;**(Sanchez discloses in one embodiment, when the network node receives a multicast packet via an incoming interface, the network node performs two table lookups; Paragraph [8])**

and a lookup restriction unit, wherein the first lookup table is configured to identify first information in response to receiving a first key generated from a first portion of a packet header, **(Sanchez discloses first, the network node performs a lookup on a first table (e.g., a multicast Forwarding Information Table) to retrieve an RPF flag and a first incoming interface identifier. Paragraph [8])**

the first portion of the packet header comprising a multicast destination address, **(Sanchez discloses in operation, after receiving a multicast packet, Interface Identifier Retrieval Logic 31 examines the packet's header and retrieves two expected incoming interface identifiers--a source-specific one from the Unicast Routing Table 10 and a flow-specific one from the Multicast FIT 20 according to the header information. Paragraph [32])**

the first information identifying a portion of the second lookup table, the portion comprising at least one of the second lookup table entries;**(Sanchez discloses the network node may also perform a lookup on a second table (e.g., a Unicast Routing Table) to retrieve another incoming interface identifier; Paragraph [8])**

and the lookup restriction unit is configured to prevent a second key generated from a second portion of the packet header from matching any second lookup table entry that is not comprised in the portion of the second lookup table identified by the first information. **(Sanchez discloses the network node may also perform a lookup on a second table (e.g., a Unicast Routing Table) to retrieve another incoming interface identifier. Depending on the value of the RPF flag, the network node will select either the first incoming interface identifier or the second incoming interface identifier as the expected incoming interface for the multicast packet. Paragraph 8)**

Regarding claim 34, Sanchez teaches a computer readable medium, comprising program instructions executable to:

allocate at least one entry in a first lookup table and at least one first entry in a portion of a second lookup table for each multicast tree, the portion of the second lookup table comprising at least one entry; ***(Sanchez discloses used herein, a multicast (S,G) flow, or a (S,G) flow, refers to a sequence or stream of packets being sent from a source "S" to a multicast group "G." S refers to the unicast IP address of the source for the multicast traffic; Paragraph [21])*** and configure a lookup restriction unit to prevent a lookup in the second lookup table from matching entries not included in the portion of the second lookup table if a corresponding lookup in the first lookup table matches the at least one entry in the first lookup table. ***(Sanchez discloses the network node then compares the selected identifier to the identifier of the packet's actual incoming interface. If they match, the multicast packet is forwarded to an appropriate set of multicast outgoing interfaces. However, if the identifiers do not match, the multicast packet is dropped. Paragraph [8], see rest of paragraph [8])***

Regarding claim 35, Sanchez taught the computer readable medium of claim 34, as described above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the program instructions are further executable to: allocate a single entry in the first lookup table for each shortest-path multicast tree. ***(Sanchez fig. 2)***

Regarding claim 37, Sanchez in view of Templin taught the computer readable medium of claim 36, wherein the program instructions are further executable to:

allocate a plurality of entries in the second lookup table for each shared multicast tree, **(Sanchez Fig. 2)** wherein each of the entries corresponds to a respective one of a plurality of scopes, and each of the entries only identifies output interfaces included in a zone of the respective one of the plurality of scopes. **(Templin discloses here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

Regarding claim 39, Sanchez taught the computer readable medium of claim 34, as described above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the program instructions are further executable to: access a first lookup table based on a first portion of a packet header, wherein the first lookup table identifies the portion of a second lookup table; and access the portion of the second lookup table based on a second portion of the packet header. **(Sanchez discloses in operation, after receiving a multicast packet, Interface Identifier Retrieval Logic 31 examines the packet's header and retrieves two expected incoming interface identifiers--a source-specific one from the Unicast Routing Table 10 and a flow-specific one from the Multicast FIT 20 according to the header information. Paragraph [32])**

Regarding claim 40, Sanchez further teaches the computer readable medium of claim 39, wherein the program instructions are further executable to:

provide a key to the second lookup table, wherein

the key is generated based on an ID of a RPF (Reverse Path

Forwarding) interface, *(Sanchez discloses however, if the RPF Flag is not set, at*

step 48, the RPF engine 50 retrieves a unicast outgoing interface identifier

corresponding to the packet's header information from the Unicast Routing

Table; Paragraph [39]) and the RPF interface received a packet in which the packet

header was comprised. *(Sanchez discloses in operation, after receiving a multicast*

packet, Interface Identifier Retrieval Logic 31 examines the packet's header and

retrieves two expected incoming interface identifiers--a source-specific one from

the Unicast Routing Table 10 and a flow-specific one from the Multicast FIT 20

according to the header information. Paragraph [32])

Regarding claim 41, Sanchez teaches a system comprising:

means for accessing a first lookup table based on a first portion of a packet header,

wherein the first portion of the packet header comprises a multicast destination

address, *(Sanchez discloses in operation, after receiving a multicast packet,*

Interface Identifier Retrieval Logic 31 examines the packet's header and retrieves

two expected incoming interface identifiers--a source-specific one from the

Unicast Routing Table 10 and a flow-specific one from the Multicast FIT 20

according to the header information. Paragraph [32]) and

the first lookup table identifies a portion of a second lookup table, the portion of the

second lookup table comprising at least one entry; *(Sanchez discloses The network*

node may also perform a lookup on a second table (e.g., a Unicast Routing Table) to retrieve another incoming interface identifier; Paragraph [8]) and means for accessing the portion of the second lookup table based on a second portion of the packet header. **(Sanchez discloses in one embodiment, when the network node receives a multicast packet via an incoming interface, the network node performs two table lookups; Paragraph [8])**

Regarding claim 53, Sanchez taught the system of claim 42, as described above.

Sanchez further comprising:

means for allocating a single entry in the first lookup table for each shortest-path multicast tree. **(Sanchez discloses whether the router has already joined the Shortest Path Tree (SPT) for the (S,G) flow; Paragraph [20])**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
8. Claims 3-5, 17, 18, 21-23, 32, 33, 36, 43-45, 54, 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez (2003/0223402) in view of Templin (2001/0040895)

Regarding claims 3, 21 & 43, Sanchez taught the method and system of claim 2, 21 & 42, as described above. Templin further teaches wherein the portion of the second lookup table corresponds to one of a plurality of scopes.

Sanchez does not explicitly disclose these limitations however Templin does teach not explicitly teach wherein the portion of the second lookup table corresponds to one of a plurality of scopes. ***(Templin discloses Here, when the bit 'u' equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit 'u' equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])***

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the time of the invention to modify Sanchez's efficient reverse path forwarding check mechanism to include Templin's IPv6-IPv4 compatibility system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to have a system which will be more efficient, and in less expensive way being able to transition IPv4 systems to IPv6 especially with legacy equipment. *Templin discloses these approaches are expensive in terms of configuration and operational administrative resources, and do not adapt to network topology changes. Another approach uses "dynamic tunneling," but requires*

the use of IPv6 multicast address. Thus, there remains the need for a mechanism that accommodates the transition of networks from IPv4 to IPv6 without the aforementioned problems; Paragraph [5].

Therefore, it would be obvious to combine Sanchez and Templin to show the limitations taught in claims 3, 21, & 43.

Regarding claims 4, 22 & 44, Sanchez in view of Templin taught the method and system of claims 3, 21 & 43, as describe above. Templin further teaches wherein the portion of the second lookup table corresponds to a link-local scope of the scopes if a scope of the multicast destination address is link-local; **(Templin discloses IPv4 multicast addressing for link state messages; Paragraph [139])**

the portion of the second lookup table corresponds to a site-local scope of the scopes if the scope of the multicast destination address is site-local; **(Templin discloses Here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

And the portion of the second lookup table corresponds to a global scope of the scopes if the scope of the multicast destination address is global. **(Templin discloses Here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

Regarding claim 5, 23 & 45, Sanchez in view of Templin taught the method and system of claims 4, 22 & 44, as described above. Templin further teaches wherein

if a scope of the source address comprised in the packet header is less than the scope of the multicast destination address, each entry comprised in the portion of the second lookup table identifies only output interfaces associated with one of a plurality of zones, **(Templin discloses In particular, the TBRPF protocol allows an update to be sent either on a common broadcast channel or on one or more unicast channels, depending on the number of neighbors that need to receive the update; Paragraph [43])** and a scope of the one of the zones is equal to the scope of the source address. **(Templin discloses thus, for the examples above, each router 14 in the subnet 10 that detects a change in a link to node A 12, (e.g., node B 14 in the cost of the link (B, A)), operates as the source (i.e., source node) of an update; Paragraph [42])**

Regarding claim 17, Sanchez taught the method of claim 16, as described above.

Templin further teaches comprising:

for each shared multicast tree, allocating a first entry and a second entry in the first lookup table, **(Sanchez fig 2)** wherein the first entry matches a source address having a global scope, and the second entry matches a source address having a non-global scope. **(Templin discloses Here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

Regarding claim 18, Sanchez in view of Templin taught the method of claim 17, as described above. Templin further teaches comprising:
allocating a plurality of entries in the second lookup table for each shared multicast tree, wherein each of the entries corresponds to a respective one of a plurality of scopes, and each of the entries only identifies output interfaces included in a zone of the respective one of the plurality of scopes. **(Templin discloses Here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

Regarding claims 32 & 54, Sanchez in view of Templin taught the system of claims 31 53, as described above. Wherein
the first lookup table comprises a first entry and a second entry for each shared multicast tree, **(Sanchez paragraph [12])** the first entry matches a source address having a global scope, and the second entry matches a source address having a non-global scope. **(Templin discloses Here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

Regarding claim 33 & 55, Sanchez in view of Templin taught the system of claims 32 & 54, as described above. Sanchez in view of Templin further teaches wherein the second lookup table comprises a plurality of entries for each shared multicast tree, **(Sanchez paragraph [12])**

each of the entries corresponds to a respective one of a plurality of scopes, and each of the entries only identifies output interfaces included in a zone of the respective one of the plurality of scopes. **(Templin discloses here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

Regarding claim 36, Sanchez taught the computer readable medium of claim 34, as described above. Wherein the program instructions are further executable to: allocate a first entry and a second entry in the first lookup table for each shared multicast tree, **(Sanchez Fig. 2)** wherein the first entry matches a source address having a global scope, and the second entry matches a source address having a non-global scope. **(Templin discloses here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

9. Claims 8-12, 14, 15, 26, 27, 30, 31, 38, 48, 49, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez (2003/0223402) in view of Arunachalam (7466703),

Regarding claim 8, Sanchez taught the method of claim 2, as described above. Arunachalam further teaches comprising:
the first lookup table indicating at least one of an access control rule and a quality of service level in response to receiving a key associated with a packet. **(Arunachalam**

discloses for each filter specification, there is an associated QoS assignment, which identifies how the packets matched this filter are scheduled by the SRI.

Column 19 lines 56-59)

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the time of the invention to modify Sanchez's efficient reverse path forwarding check mechanism to include Arunachalam's scalable high speed router apparatus. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to have a system with routers with the capability to process different protocols and services along with other useful features. In addition, routers that are required to support differentiated services must be able to process more than the destination address of the packet, including for example the source address, the protocol type, the protocol port numbers if available, the Type-of-Service bits etc. Such routers must be also capable of processing all packets as they arrive without requiring any storing of packets before processing for every type of packet arrivals, irrespective of the size of the packets or the information in the packet headers: column 1 lines 26-35.

Therefore, it would be obvious to combine Sanchez and Arunachalam to show the limitations taught in claim 8.

Regarding claim 9, Sanchez in view of Arunachalam taught the method of claim 8, as described above. Sanchez further teaches comprising:
the second lookup table indicating a state of a network flow in response to receiving a key associated with a packet. **(Sanchez discloses wherein the RPF flag value is**

**representative of a state of a multicast flow that includes the multicast packet;
Claim 8)**

Regarding claim 10, Sanchez in view of Arunachalam taught the method of claim 8, as described above. Arunachalam further teaches comprising:

accessing a third lookup table to forward a packet addressed to an IPv6

(Internet Protocol version 6) unicast destination address, **(Arunachalam discloses**

RSVP is designed to operate with both unicast and multicast routing-protocols;

Column 1926-29) Wherein a width of each entry in the third lookup table is less than a

width of a key comprising both an IPv6 destination address and an IPv6 source

address. **(Arunachalam discloses the route manager supports all standard**

routing protocols for IPv4, IPv6, and IPX. The following IP routing protocols are supported: Column 18 lines 1-3)

Regarding claim 11, Sanchez taught the method of claim 2, as describe above.

Aunachalam further teaches wherein the first lookup table identifies the portion of the

second lookup table by identifying a mask, wherein a key generated using the mask

only matches entries comprised in the portion of the second lookup table. **(Aunachalam**

discloses the above IP source and destination addresses can also be combined

with subnet masks to identify a range of IP addresses; Column 19 lines 51-55)

Regarding claim 12, Sanchez in view of Arunachalam taught the method of claim 11, as

describe above. Arunachalam further teaches comprising:

applying the mask to the multicast destination address and an interface ID, wherein the interface ID identifies an input interface that received a packet comprising the packet header. ***(Aunachalam discloses the above IP source and destination addresses can also be combined with subnet masks to identify a range of IP addresses; Column 19 lines 51-55)***

Regarding claim 14, Sanchez in view of Arunachalam taught the method of claim 12, as described above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the mask selects all of the source address if the accessing the first lookup table comprised matching an entry, which corresponds to a shortest-path multicast tree, in the first lookup table. **(Sanchez discloses whether the router has already joined the Shortest Path Tree (SPT) for the (S,G) flow; Paragraph [20])**

Regarding claim 15, Sanchez in view of Arunachalam taught the method of claim 11, as described above. Sanchez in view of Arunachalam further teaches comprising applying the mask to the second portion of the packet header to produce a masked second portion; and generating a hash based on the masked second portion, wherein the accessing the second lookup table **(Sanchez fig 2)** dependent on the second portion providing a key comprising the hash to the second lookup table. **(Arunachalam discloses the search is done with the use of a hash table 410 as shown in FIG. 17(a); Column 15 lines 26-27)**

Regarding claims 26 & 48, Sanchez taught the system of claims 20 & 48, as described above. Aunachalam further teaches wherein the first information comprises a mask, wherein a key generated using the mask only matches second lookup table entries comprised in the portion of the second lookup table. ***(Arunachalam discloses the above IP source and destination addresses can also be combined with subnet masks to identify a range of IP addresses; Column 19 lines 51-55)***

Regarding claims 27 & 49, Sanchez in view of Arunachalam taught the system of claim 26 & 48, as described above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the mask is applied to a source address, the multicast destination address, and an interface ID to generate the second key, **(Sanchez discloses In one embodiment, when the RPF flag is set, the flow-specific identifier retrieved from the Multicast FIT 20 is selected. When the RPF flag is not set, the source-specific retrieved from the Unicast Routing Table 10 is selected; Paragraph [33])** the source address is comprised in the packet header, and the interface ID identifies an input interface that received a packet comprising the packet header. **(Sanchez discloses the Interface Selection Logic 32, depending on the value of the retrieved RPF flag, selects one of the two expected incoming interface identifiers for use in RPF checks. Paragraph [33])**

Regarding claims 30, Sanchez in view of Arunachalam taught the system of claim 26, as described above. Arunachalam further teaches wherein the mask is applied to the second portion of the packet header to produce a masked second portion, a hash is generated based on the masked second portion, and the second key comprises the hash. **(Arunachalam discloses the search is done with the use of a hash table 410 as shown in FIG. 17(a); Column 15 lines 26-27)**

Regarding claim 31, Sanchez taught the system of claim 20, as described above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the first lookup table comprises one first lookup table entry for each shortest-path multicast tree. **(Sanchez paragraph [12])**

Regarding claim 38, Sanchez taught the computer readable medium of claim 34, as described above. Sanchez in view of Aunachalam teaches wherein the program instructions are further executable to: configure the lookup restriction unit by storing a mask in a mask table, **(Sanchez discloses first, the network node performs a lookup on a first table (e.g., a multicast Forwarding Information Table) to retrieve an RPF flag and a first incoming interface identifier. Paragraph [8])**wherein a key generated using the mask will only match entries comprised in the portion of the second lookup table. **(Aunachalam discloses the above IP source and destination addresses can also be combined with subnet masks to identify a range of IP addresses; Column 19 lines 51-55)**

Regarding claim 52, Sanchez taught the system of claim 42, as described above.

Sanchez in view of Arunachalam further teaches comprising

means for applying the mask to the second portion of the packet header to

produce a masked second portion; ***(Aunachalam discloses the above IP source and destination addresses can also be combined with subnet masks to identify a***

range of IP addresses; Column 19 lines 51-55) and means for generating a hash based on the masked second portion, wherein accessing the second lookup table

dependent on the second portion of the packet header comprises: providing a key

comprising the hash to the second lookup table. ***(Arunachalam discloses the search***

is done with the use of a hash table 410 as shown in FIG. 17(a); Column 15 lines 26-27)

10. Claims 13, 28, 29, 50 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez (2003/0223402) in view of Arunachalam(7466703) in further view of Templin (2001/0040895),

Regarding claim 13, Sanchez in view of Arunachalam taught the method of claim 12,

as described above. Templin further teaches wherein the packet header comprises a

source address; the mask selects a portion of the source address identifying a scope of the source address if the source address has a non-global scope; ***(Templin discloses***

Here, when the bit 'u' equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the

bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])

the mask does not select any of the source address if the source address has a global scope. **(Templin discloses Here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art before the time of the invention to modify Sanchez's efficient reverse path forwarding check mechanism, Arunachalam's scalable high speed router apparatus to include Templin's IPv6-IPv4 compatibility system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to have a system which will be more efficient, and in less expensive way being able to transition IPv4 systems to IPv6 especially with legacy equipment. *Templin discloses these approaches are expensive in terms of configuration and operational administrative resources, and do not adapt to network topology changes. Another approach uses "dynamic tunneling," but requires the use of IPv6 multicast address. Thus, there remains the need for a mechanism that accommodates the transition of networks from IPv4 to IPv6 without the aforementioned problems; Paragraph [5].*

Therefore, it would be obvious to combine Sanchez, Arunachalam and Templin to show the limitations taught in claims 3, 21, & 43.

Regarding claims 28 & 50, Sanchez in view of Arunachalam taught the system of claims 27 & 49, as described above. Templin further teaches wherein

the mask selects a portion of the source address identifying a scope of the source address if the source address has a non-global scope; **(Templin discloses Here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

the mask does not select any of the source address if the source address has a global scope. **(Templin discloses Here, when the bit `u` equals 1, the scope of the address is global and when the bit `u` equals 0, the scope is local; Paragraph [227])**

Regarding claim 29 & 51, Sanchez, Arunachalam in further view of Templin taught the system of claims 28 & 50, as described above. Templin further teaches wherein the mask selects all of the source address if the accessing the first lookup table comprised matching an entry, which corresponds to a shortest-path multicast tree, in the first lookup table. **(Templin discloses the link-state-routing protocol, referred to as a topology broadcast based on reverse-path forwarding (TBRPF) protocol, seeks to substantially minimize the amount of update and control traffic required to maintain shortest (or nearly shortest) paths to all destinations in the subnet 10; Paragraph [41]),**

Conclusion

11. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited to establish the level of skill in the applicant's art and those arts considered reasonably pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See **MPEP 707.05(c)**.

The following reference teaches execution of trial data.

PATENT or Applications

- US 7079499
- US 200600393374
- US 20010053150
- US 20060085797

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Guang Li whose telephone number is (571) 270-1897. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30AM-5:00PM(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/GERALD SMARTH/

Examiner, Art Unit 2446

/Jeffrey Pwu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446